

Observational Evidence for Superfluidity, and Pinning, in the Core of Neutron Stars

M. Jahan-Miri

Institute for Advanced Studies in Basic Sciences, Zanzan 45195, IRAN

ABSTRACT

The observed large rates of spinning down after glitches in some radio pulsars has been previously explained in terms of a long-term spin-up behaviour of a superfluid part of the crust of neutron stars. We argue that the suggested mechanism is not viable; being inconsistent with the basic requirements for a superfluid spin-up, in addition to its quantitative disagreement with the data. One may therefore conclude, for the first time, that the presence and the pinned nature of neutron superfluid in the core of neutron stars is evidenced by the existing observational data.

Subject headings: stars: neutron – hydrodynamics – pulsars: individual (Vela Pulsar)

1. Introduction

The observational data we are invoking is more than a decade old. Also, its implication is rather straightforward, once it is realized that there exist no alternative explanation for the data, based on the role of the (superfluid in the) crust alone. The present discussion tends to show the fallacy in the only alternative possibility which has been raised to the opposite; thus paving the way to the obvious, though so far abandoned, implication of the data on the large post-glitch excess spin-down rates of radio pulsars for the role of the stellar core. The alternative suggestion has invoked a spinning up of the crustal superfluid by the spinning down crust (“the container”) over a time much larger than the associated relaxation timescale (Alpar, Pines & Cheng 1990; hereafter APC90). However, a closer look at the relative rotation of the superfluid and its vortices reveals that the suggested mechanism fails quantitatively by, at least, more than an order of magnitudes. In addition, the suggested spin-up process is also argued to be in contradiction with the well-known requirements for a superfluid spin-up. This will lead us to the conclusion that the observed effect indicates the presence of a superfluid component, as well as the pinning of its vortices, in the core of neutron stars. We wish to emphasize that the point of the present discussion is *only* to point at the above implication of the data, for which no valid observational evidence has been, so far, invoked (eg., Alpar 1992). The conclusion of the paper would naturally call for, and would be further supported by, a detailed and successful modelling of the post-glitch response of a pinned superfluid component of the core. The latter is nevertheless a separate and independent problem which is not the subject of the present discussion, and which has been addressed previously (eg., Muslimov & Tsygan 1985; Chau, Cheng & Ding 1992; Sedrakian & Sedrakian 1995; Jahan-Miri 1996).

2. Overview

The spin-down rate $\dot{\Omega}_c$ of the crust of a neutron star, with a moment of inertia I_c , obeys (Baym et. al. 1969a)

$$I_c \dot{\Omega}_c = N_{\text{em}} - \Sigma I_i \dot{\Omega}_i \quad (1)$$

where N_{em} is the negative electromagnetic torque on the star, and $\dot{\Omega}_i$ and I_i denote the rate of change of rotation frequency and the moment of inertia of each of the separate components, respectively, which are

summed over. Steady state implies $\dot{\Omega}_i = \dot{\Omega}_c = \dot{\Omega} \equiv \frac{N_{\text{em}}}{I}$, for all i , where $I = I_c + \Sigma I_i$ is the total moment of inertia of the star. Different models for the post-glitch recovery, and in particular the model of vortex-creep, aim to explain it in terms of a decoupling-recoupling of the superfluid component in the *crust* of neutron stars (Alpar et. al. 1984; Jones 1991; Epstein et. al. 1992). The rest of the star including the core (superfluid) is assumed in these models to be rotationally coupled to the non-superfluid constituents of the crust, on timescales much shorter than that resolved in a glitch.

The role of a superfluid component of a neutron star in its post-glitch behavior is understood as follows. Spinning down (up) of a superfluid at a given rate is associated with a corresponding rate of outward (inward) radial motion of its vortices. If vortices are subject to pinning, as is assumed for the superfluid in the crust of a neutron star, a spin-down (up) would require unpinning of the vortices. This may be achieved under the influence of a Magnus force $\vec{F}_M$ acting on the vortices, which is given, per unit length, as (eg., Sauls 1989)

$$\vec{F}_M = -\rho_s \vec{\kappa} \times (\vec{v}_s - \vec{v}_L) \quad (2)$$

where ρ_s is the superfluid density, $\vec{\kappa}$ is the vorticity of the vortex line directed along the rotation axis (its magnitude $\kappa = \frac{h}{2m_n}$ for the neutron superfluid, where m_n is the mass of a neutron), and $\vec{v}_s$ and $\vec{v}_L$ are the local superfluid and vortex-line velocities. Thus, if a lag $\omega \equiv \Omega_s - \Omega_c$ exist between the rotation frequency Ω_s of the superfluid and that of the vortices (pinned and co-rotating with the crust) a radially directed Magnus force $(F_M)_r = \rho_s \kappa r \omega$ would act on the vortices, where r is the distance from the rotation axis, and $\omega > 0$ corresponds to an outward directed $(F_M)_r$, vice-versa. The crust-superfluid may therefore follow the steady-state spin-down of the star by maintaining a critical lag ω_{crit} which will enable the vortices to overcome the pinning barriers. The critical lag is thus defined through the balancing $(F_M)_r$ with the pinning forces.

At a glitch a sudden increase in Ω_c would result in $\omega < \omega_{\text{crit}}$, hence the superfluid becomes decoupled and could no longer follow the spinning down of the star (ie. its container). If, as is suggested (Anderson & Itoh 1975), the glitch is due to a sudden outward release of some of the pinned vortices the associated decrease in Ω_s would also add to the decrease in ω , in the same regions. Therefore a fractional increase $\frac{\Delta \dot{\Omega}_c}{\dot{\Omega}_c}$ same as the fractional moment of inertia of the

decoupled superfluid would be expected. This situation will however persist only till $\omega = \omega_{\text{crit}}$ is restored again (due to the spinning down of the crust) and the superfluid recouples, as illustrated by Ω_s and Ω_c curves in Fig. 1. The vortex creep model suggests (Alpar et. al. 1984) further that a superfluid spin-down may be achieved even while $\omega < \omega_{\text{crit}}$, due to the creeping of the vortices via their thermally activated and/or quantum tunneling motions. A superfluid spin-down with a steady-state value of $\omega < \omega_{\text{crit}}$, and also a post-glitch smooth gradual turn over to the complete recoupling for each superfluid layer is thus predicted in this model. Notice however that due to the varying amplitude of the glitch-induced jump in Ω_s (Alpar et. al. 1984) the sharp recoupling of each layer, in the absence of creeping, may occur at a different time. Hence the post-glitch recovery of $\dot{\Omega}_c$, being accomplished over an extended time period as the different layers of the superfluid recouple, could behave smoothly even in the absence of any creep. The induced $\frac{\Delta\dot{\Omega}_c}{\dot{\Omega}_c}$ during a superfluid decoupling phase according to the creep model is however the same as (or slightly smaller than) otherwise.

3. The Problem

Recent glitches in Vela, and one in PSR 0355+54, have shown values of $\frac{\Delta\dot{\Omega}_c}{\dot{\Omega}_c} > 10\%$ with recovery timescales ~ 0.4 d, and ~ 44 d, respectively (Lyne 1987; APC90; Flanagan 1995). The data hence imply (Eq. 1) that a part of the star with a fractional moment of inertia $> 10\%$ ($\sim 60\%$) is decoupled from the crust during its observed post-glitch response. This is, however, in sharp contradiction with the above glitch models, since for the moment of inertia I_{crust} of the crustal superfluid $\frac{I_{\text{crust}}}{I} \lesssim 2.5\%$ (APC90; Chau et. al. 1993). It should be realized that the disagreement with the data is a fundamental shortcoming for the crustal models; not just a quantitative mismatch. Because, the predicted increase for $\frac{\Delta\dot{\Omega}_c}{\dot{\Omega}_c}$ in these models is naturally bound to be smaller than the fractional moment of inertia of the superfluid (also see the best fit results of Alpar et. al. 1993; Chau et. al. 1993); except for the possibility raised in APC90 which is the point of issue in the following.

APC90 suggest that the observed large values of $\frac{\Delta\dot{\Omega}_c}{\dot{\Omega}_c} \sim 20\%$ over a time ~ 0.4 d, in Vela, could be accounted for by assuming that a part of the crustal superfluid *spins up*, over the *same* period of time.

The superfluid would then act as a source of an additional spin-down torque on the rest of the star and could, in principle, result in $\frac{\Delta\dot{\Omega}_c}{\dot{\Omega}_c}$ values much larger than its own fractional moment of inertia. For this to be realized, a region of the crust-superfluid with a moment of inertia I_{sp} and a spin frequency Ω_{sp} has been assumed to support a tiny (positive) steady-state lag $\omega_{\text{sp}} \equiv \Omega_{\text{sp}} - \Omega_c \sim 3.5 \times 10^{-6} \text{ rad s}^{-1}$, in contrast to the much larger steady-state value of the lag $\omega \geq 10^{-2} \text{ rad s}^{-1}$ in the rest of the crust-superfluid. Hence, a glitch of a size $\Delta\Omega_c \sim 10^{-4} \text{ rad s}^{-1}$ would result in a “reversed” situation where $\Omega_c \gg \Omega_{\text{sp}}$, and which is further suggested (APC90) to be followed by a spinning up of the superfluid over a period τ_{sp} , as indicated in Fig. 1a.

4. Quantitative Check

The above spin-up scenario is however unable to account for the observed effect, quantitatively. In contrast to the assumption of APC90 that the total original frequency difference ($\Omega_c - \Omega_{\text{sp}}$), induced by the glitch, is slowly relaxed during the period τ_{sp} we argue that only a small fraction of it might be at all preserved for any such “long-term” spin-up process. This is because the superfluid would be otherwise rotating much slower than its vortices which are, by virtue of their assumed pinning, co-rotating with the crust (see Fig. 1a); that is, the superfluid rotational lag with its vortices would be *much larger* than the associated critical lag. If so, the pinning could not impede the vortex motions (§ 2) and a fast superfluid spin-up should be expected. In order to allow for the suggested large frequency difference between the superfluid and the crust, and at the same time for a rotational lag (between the superfluid and its vortices) *smaller* than the associated critical value one needs to further assume that the pinning is “switched off”, in contradiction to the assumed pinning conditions. Nevertheless, the superfluid relaxation would be still expected to take place very fast, as is further discussed below. It may be recalled that the critical lag is, by definition, the minimum lag required for the Magnus force on vortices to overcome the pinning forces. When the instantaneous lag exceeds its critical value, then the pinning forces (in the azimuthal direction) would act further as a major source for the torque on the superfluid, resulting in a relaxation even faster than in the absence of any pinning (see, eg., Tsakadze & Tsakadze 1980; Adams, Cieplak &

Glaberson 1985).

The above argument may be further clarified by directly considering the behaviour of the rotation frequency Ω_L of the *vortices* (in the region with Ω_{sp}) at the glitch, which has not been explicitly specified in APC90. We, therefore, discuss the two exclusive possibilities that might arise, and could be, in principle, physically justified. Both cases lead, however, to the same conclusion; intermediate cases for which no justification exist should naturally fall in between (and there is no indication in APC90 for any special effect due to such cases). It may be noted that the cases to be considered should not be, however, paralleled to the classification of (strong, weak, superweak) pinning regions, as invoked in the literature on the vortex creep model. The latter is based on the relative magnitude of the critical lag and reflects the long term behaviour of the superfluid relaxation toward its steady state lag value. In contrast, the following two cases concerns the instantaneous response of the originally pinned vortices upon a sudden jump in the rotation rate of the container (see Fig. 1). Either, **a)** the vortices are spun up along with the crust (container), that is they remain pinned *during* the sudden spin-up of the container. Or else **b)** if their pinning is temporarily broken, they must relax to a state of co-rotating with the superfluid itself. Hence, either $\Omega_L = \Omega_c$ (pinning conditions), or else $\Omega_L = \Omega_{sp}$ (Hemholtz theorem), just *at* the beginning of the interval τ_{sp} after the jump in Ω_c (see Fig. 1a).

In the case **(a)**, the superfluid must have been also spun up, along with the crust and the vortices, to (at least) a state such that $\Omega_{sp} - \Omega_c = -\omega_{sp}$ (contrast with APC90's picture as depicted in Fig. 1a); otherwise the pinning would be broken (contrary to the assumption) by the associated radial Magnus force on the vortices. Experiments on superfluid Helium have indeed showed (Tsakadze & Tsakadze 1975; Alpar 1978; Tsakadze & Tsakadze 1980) that a pinned superfluid either is spun up along with its vessel, or it never does so during the subsequent spinning down of the vessel (when $|\Omega_{sp} - \Omega_L| < \omega_{sp}$). Also according to the vortex creep model (see Eq. 6 in Cheng et. al. 1988), the superfluid spin-up (-down) timescale should be extremely short ($\lesssim 10^{-7}$ s for the above case in Vela) given that $|\Omega_{sp} - \Omega_L| \geq \omega_{sp}$, as would be the case if only the vortices, but not the superfluid, are assumed to be spun up with the crust.

The case **(b)**, on the other hand, is not in accord with the general pinning conditions assumed in the

vortex creep model, and is not likely to be invoked in that context. Nevertheless, the superfluid spin-up in the crust of a neutron star, for such a case of free unpinned vortices, is again expected to occur over very short timescales. The longest timescale for the spin-up of the crust by freely moving vortices, due to nuclear scattering alone, has been estimated (Epstein et. al. 1992) to be only $\lesssim 5$ s, for the Vela pulsar. Such a fast spin-up (-down) of the superfluid in the crust of a neutron star, by the freely moving vortices, is in fact invoked in the vortex creep model as the cause of glitch itself (Anderson & Itoh 1975). Therefore, and in either cases **(a or b)**, the superfluid would be spun up to (at least) a frequency such that $\Omega_{sp} - \Omega_c = -\omega_{sp}$, within a period of only few seconds while the jump in Ω_c takes place at the glitch (see Fig. 1b). Notice that the steady-state lag ω_{sp} according to the vortex creep model would be slightly smaller than the critical lag (though slightly larger in the absence of any creeping). The difference is however a tiny fraction of the critical value itself (Alpar et. al. 1984), and is therefore neglected in the present discussion.

Hence, the frequency difference $\Delta\Omega$ between the crust and the superfluid, at the start of τ_{sp} , would be $\Delta\Omega = \omega_{sp} \sim 3.5 \times 10^{-6}$ rad s $^{-1}$. This is the total available range of rotation frequency that one might, in principle, assume to be equilibrated any further between the crust and the superfluid. In contrast, a value of $\Delta\Omega = \Delta\Omega_c \sim 1.3 \times 10^{-4}$ rad s $^{-1}$ has been used in APC90. Assuming, for the time, that any further spin-up of the superfluid may occur, its duration, τ_{sp} , may be estimated from (Baym et. al. 1969a; see also Eq. 2b in APC90)

$$(\Delta\dot{\Omega}_c)_{sp} = \frac{I_{sp}}{I} \frac{\Delta\Omega}{\tau_{sp}} \quad (3)$$

where $(\Delta\dot{\Omega}_c)_{sp}$ is the magnitude of the change in $\dot{\Omega}_c$ due to the spinning up of the superfluid. Adopting the same parameter values as in APC90, ie. $(\Delta\dot{\Omega}_c)_{sp}/\dot{\Omega}_c = 0.2$, $\frac{I_{sp}}{I} = 5.3 \times 10^{-3}$, $\Delta\Omega = \omega_{sp} = 3.5 \times 10^{-6}$ rad s $^{-1}$, and $\dot{\Omega}_c = 9.5 \times 10^{-11}$ rad s $^{-2}$ for Vela, one derives from Eq. 3 a value of

$$\tau_{sp} < 0.3 \text{ hr}, \quad (4)$$

which is *too short* as compared with the observed timescales ~ 0.4 d. Thus, the crust-superfluid cannot be the cause for the observed large spin-down rates even in the case of 1988 glitch of the Vela pulsar, addressed in APC90. The disagreement between

the predicted and observed timescales would be even worse for the case of 1991 glitch of the same pulsar, having observed values of $\Delta\dot{\Omega}_c/\dot{\Omega}_c \sim 60\%$ over a similar relaxation time (Flanagan 1995). Also, an attempt to apply the same crust-superfluid spin-up scenario to the case of PSR 0355+54 would result in more than *three* orders of magnitudes difference between the predicted τ_{sp} and the observed relaxation time ~ 40 days.

5. Superfluid Spin-up

Moreover, the suggested spin-up scenario of APC90 should be dismissed at once since the required torque on the superfluid, during τ_{sp} , may not be realized at all, under the assumed conditions (see Fig. 1a). That is the pinned superfluid could not be spun *up* by the crust (ie. its container) while the latter is spinning *down*. This is simply because a spinning down vessel (or even one with a stationary constant rotation rate) albeit rotating faster than its contained superfluid could not result in any further *spin up* of the vortex lattice which is, by virtue of the assumed pinning, already *co-rotating* with it!. As is well-known, an inward radial motion of the vortices, associated with a spin-up of the superfluid, may only occur in the presence of a corresponding forward azimuthal external force acting on them. This is indeed a trivial fact, considering that any torque on the bulk superfluid may be applied only by means of the vortices. However, no forward azimuthal force (via scattering processes between the constituents particles of the vortex-cores and the crust) may be exerted by the spinning down crust on the vortex lattice which is already co-rotating with it. Thus, no superfluid spin-up might be expected to occur during the interval τ_{sp} , namely after the spinning up of the crust and *vortices* has been accomplished (compare Fig. 1a with Fig. 1b). Notice that the requirement for a superfluid spin-up, namely that the vortices be rotating slower than the crust while the latter is itself slowing down, is inherently inconsistent with the assumed pinning conditions.

The suggested long-term spin-up in APC90 is a generalization of the vortex creep model for the case of a *negative* lag, in contrast to the usual post-glitch spinning-down due to a positive lag invoked in the model (eg., Pines & Alpar 1992). However, according to the existing formulation of the vortex creep model, a spinning up of the superfluid would require a *positive* torque N_{em} acting on the whole star (see, eg.,

Eqs. 28, and 38 in Alpar et. al 1984). Application of the same formalism to the suggested spin-up episode in presence of the given *negative* N_{em} (which is attempted in Eq. 5 of APC90) is not, a priori, justified; it is contradictory.

The vortex creep model suggests that a radial Magnus force, due to a superfluid rotational lag, results in a radial bias in the otherwise randomly directed creeping of the vortices (Alpar et. al. 1984). This might be, mistakenly, interpreted to require that given a negative lag the inward creeping motion of the vortices, hence a superfluid spin-up, should necessarily follow, irrespective of the presence or absence of the needed torque on the superfluid. It should be however noted that the role of driving the vortices inward, ie. spinning up of the superfluid, may not be assigned to the Magnus force. The Magnus force associated with the rotational lag is a *radial* force and is also exerted by the superfluid *itself*; both properties disqualifying it for being the source of a torque. Thus, the point which is to be emphasized here is that the obvious requirement for a spin-up process, namely the corresponding torque, is indeed missing in the suggested mechanism of APC90. Accordingly, the inability of the superfluid to be spun up, in this case, should *not* be understood as a direct consequence of the pinning preventing a vortex radial motion, which could be possibly cured by any assumed radial creeping motions. Rather, the vortices under the assumed conditions do not have any “tendency” for an inward radial motion, in spite of the presence of an inward radial Magnus force which is balanced by the pinning forces. A change in the spin frequency of a superfluid involves not only a radial motion of the vortices but also a corresponding azimuthal one, as may be also verified from the solution of equation of motion of vortices during a superfluid rotational relaxation (see Eq. 9 in Alpar & Sauls 1988 and Eq. 4 in Jahan-Miri 1998). The torque may be transmitted during only such an azimuthal motion and would nevertheless require and initiate a radial motion as well. Therefore, purely *radial* creeping of the vortices, which is implied by the existing formulation of the vortex creep model, may not be invoked as a spinning-up mechanism during the transition from $\Omega_{sp} - \Omega_L = -\omega_{sp}$ to $\Omega_{sp} \gtrsim \Omega_L$. The superfluid would rather remain decoupled at a constant value of Ω_{sp} (if not spinning down) during this transition which is achieved due only to the spinning down of the crust, as illustrated in Fig. 1b.

6. Concluding

Decoupling of (a part of) the moment of inertia of the crust at a glitch, from the rest of the corotating star, could readily account for the excess post-glitch spin-down rates comparable to the fractional moment of inertia of the decoupled part. The same preliminary fact applies to a (partial) decoupling of a (pinned) superfluid component in the crust, or elsewhere in the star, for that matter, as well. As suggested by APC90, a component (say, in the crust) may result in an even larger excess spin-down rate for the star if the decoupled component is further assumed to be spinning up while the rest of the star is spinning down; ie. a *negative* coupling instead of a mere decoupling. Nevertheless, as we have shown the suggested mechanism of APC90 for such a negative coupling of a pinned superfluid part in the crust of a neutron star not only fails quantitatively to account for the observed effect in pulsars, it is also ruled out conceptually since the required torque on the superfluid could not be realized at all.

Thus, the (pinned) crust-superfluid may not be invoked as the cause of the observed large changes in the spin-down rates of neutron stars. One is therefore left to conclude definitely that the observed effect, over timescales of a day and more, is caused by the stellar core, having a large moment of inertia I_{core} , with $\frac{I_{\text{core}}}{I} \sim 90\%$. This is, however, by itself an obvious observational evidence for the *superfluidity* and at the same time *pinning* of the vortices in the core of a neutron star, given the current “standard” picture of the interior of these stars (Sauls 1989; Pines & Alpar 1992). For, a non-superfluid core would couple to the crust on very short timescales ($< 10^{-11}$ s) (Baym et. al 1996b), and could not have any footprint left in the observed post-glitch relaxation. Also, a core-superfluid with free (unpinned) vortices would be again expected to have very short coupling timescales of the order of less than one or two minutes (Alpar & Sauls 1988; Pines & Alpar 1992; Jahan-Miri 1998).

The above conclusion, for the presence of pinned core superfluid, being a requirement of the observational data is obviously independent of any specific model for the pinning in the core and the post-glitch effects of the superfluid relaxation. It is appreciated that if the core-superfluid is assumed to be subject to a pinning as a *whole* and also to be *completely* decoupled at a glitch then the induced post-glitch values of $\frac{\Delta\dot{\Omega}_c}{\dot{\Omega}_c}$ would be much larger than what has been usu-

ally observed for the glitching pulsars. Nevertheless, there is no requirement for the pinning of the core superfluid that it has to comply to such tight restrictions. Given the large moment of inertia of the core, a pinning of some parts and/or a partial decoupling of the pinned component may as well be invoked so that it would result in post-glitch spin-down rates similar to that observed. Indeed, a pinning between the vortices and the proton fluxoids (Muslimov & Tsygan 1985; Sauls 1989) might offer a resolution, as is indicated by our preliminary results (Jahan-Miri 1996; Jahan-Miri 1999), even if all of the vortices in the core are assumed to be involved. The novel feature of this pinning mechanism, as it affects the rotational dynamics of the core superfluid, is the *moving* nature of the *pinning sites* which might allow for a spinning down of the superfluid even while the vortices are kept pinned! Also, the model of “proton-vortex cluster” (Sedrakian & Sedrakian 1995), invoking a somewhat different picture of the pinning in the core of neutron stars, might serve as another candidate mechanism. In any case, while the effects due to the pinned core-superfluid on the observable post-glitch relaxation of radio pulsars needs to be further demonstrated, the observed large excess spin-down rates is pointing at an apparent role played by the stellar core, for which it ought to be in a pinned superfluid state.

Raman Research Institute is acknowledged for kindly providing financial support as well as the research environment where this work could be initiated.

REFERENCES

- Adams P. W., Cieplak M., and Glaberson W. I., 1985, Phys. Rev., 32, B171
- Alpar M. A., 1978, J. Low Temp. Phys., 31, 803
- Alpar M. A., 1992, in Pines D., Tamagaki R., Tsuruta S., eds, Proc. US-Japan SENS '90, The Structure and Evolution of Neutron Stars. Addison-Wesley Pub., p. 148
- Alpar M. A., Anderson P. W., Pines D., Shaham J., 1984, ApJ, 276, 325
- Alpar M. A., Chau H. F., Cheng K. S., Pines D., 1993, Ap. J., 409, 345
- Alpar M. A., Pines D., Cheng K. S., 1990, Nat., 348, 707
- Alpar M. A., Sauls J. A., 1988, Ap. J., 327, 723
- Anderson P. W., Itoh N., 1975, Nat., 256, 25

- Baym G., Pethick C., Pines D., 1969b, *Nat.*, 224, 673
- Baym G., Pethick C., Pines D., Ruderman M., 1969a, *Nat.*, 224, 872
- Chau H. F., McCulloch P. M., Nandkumar R., Pines D., 1993, *Ap. J.*, 413, L113
- Cheng K. S., Alpar M. A., Pines D., Shaham J., 1988, *Ap. J.*, 330, 835
- Epstein R. I., Link B. K., Baym G., 1992, in Pines D., Tamagaki R., Tsuruta S., eds, *Proc. US-Japan SENS '90, The Structure and Evolution of Neutron Stars*. Addison-Wesley Pub., p. 156
- Flanagan C. S., 1995, in Alpar M. A., Kiziloğlu Ü., van Paradijs J., eds, *Proc. NATO ASI C450, The Lives of the Neutron Stars*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, p. 181
- Jahan-Miri M., 1996, PhD Thesis, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore
- Jahan-Miri M., *Ap. J.*, 1998, 501, L185
- Jahan-Miri M., 1999, to appear in *Ap. J.* (Vol. 532, March 2000)
- Jones P. B., 1991, *Ap. J.*, 373, 208
- Lyne A. G., 1987, *Nat.*, 326, 569
- Lyne A. G., 1995, in Alpar M. A., Kiziloğlu Ü., van Paradijs J., eds, *Proc. NATO ASI C450, The Lives of the Neutron Stars*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, p. 167
- Muslimov A. G. & Tsygan A. I., 1985, *Ap. & Spa. Sci.* 115, 43 .
- Pines D., Alpar M. A., 1992, in Pines D., Tamagaki R., Tsuruta S., eds, *Proc. US-Japan SENS '90, The Structure and Evolution of Neutron Stars*. Addison-Wesley Pub., p. 7
- Sauls J. A., 1989, in Ögelman H., van den Heuvel E. P. J., eds, *Proc. NATO ASI 262, Timing Neutron Stars*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, p. 457
- Sedrakian A. D., Sedrakian D. M., 1995, *Ap. J.*, 447, 305
- Tsakadze J. S., Tsakadze S. J., 1975, *Sov. Phys. Usp.*, 18, 242
- Tsakadze J. S., Tsakadze S. J., 1980, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* 39, 649

Fig. 1.— As is shown, schematically, by the *thin* and the *dotted* lines, a superfluid, as in the crust of a neutron star, whose vortices are pinned and co-rotating, at a rate Ω_c , with its spinning down vessel, may spin-down at the same rate as the vessel provided a certain lag between its rotation frequency Ω_s and Ω_c is maintained. A decrease in the lag, say at a glitch, results in a decoupling of the superfluid and hence a larger spin-down rate for the vessel. The superfluid starts spinning down again once the lag is increased to its steady-state value. The *thick* line represents the superimposed behavior of a second superfluid component, Ω_{sp} , which supports a much smaller steady-state lag. Its behaviour as implied in APC90 is shown in the panel (a), in contrast to that suggested here, shown in (b). The unresolved rising time of Ω_c at the glitch instant $t = t_g$ should be reckoned as a measure of the expected coupling time of the superfluid due to free motion of vortices, in contrast to the suggested spin-up period τ_{sp} in (a).

